

# Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology

---

Volume 44 | Issue 1

Article 1

---

1953

## Enquiry into the Causes of Crime

Giorgio Florita

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>



Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Giorgio Florita, Enquiry into the Causes of Crime, 44 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 1 (1953-1954)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

**ENQUIRY INTO THE CAUSES OF CRIME**

**Giorgio Florita**

The author, Doctor of Social Sciences, has been Chief of Police in Mantova, Italy, during many years. He has published four books: *Squadra Mobile* (Mobile Police Detachment), *Miserabili* (Wretchedness), *Delinquenza* (Delinquency) and *Maternita e Delitto* (Maternity and Crime). These books have been published by Corbaccio in Milan in the years 1938, 1939, 1944 and 1946, respectively.

Out of his long professional experience Chief Florita has developed his theory of criminal action which has attracted the attention and consideration of scientific men, though it discards some established systems of criminological thought. This theory is described and explained in the following article.—EDITOR.

In one of his recent books, "Sex and Repression among Savages", Bronislaw Malinowski, the English ethnologist who has always been an enthusiastic student of psycho-analysis, deals with the results of lengthy ethnological, social, anthropological and psychological studies on the savages of the Melanesian Islands and the conclusions he comes to, are astounding. Malinowski maintains that psycho-analysis has exaggerated and states that it has no claim to the title of "The Science of Nature". Freud did not discover a "new science", but merely made an important contribution to psychology. Malinowski searched in vain among the savages for the Oedipus complex on which the Freudian theory is almost entirely based. In that different civilization he found, however, other "complexes" and "repressions" (which were not noted by Freud in his civilized Western patients); the complexes and repressions noted by Malinowski are in relation to the effects of traditions, customs and morals of the world of savages. The surprising conclusion to which he comes is that "complexes and repressions" do not belong to human nature as such, and are not the fount and origin of social phenomena, but the product, or rather the by-product of civilization, viz. the ensemble of social laws (moral, juridical, appertaining to customs, etc.). The written statements of Malinowski take nothing away from the glory of Freud who discovered an unknown sexual life in the child from birth to the end of the prepuberty period and who opened new and wide vistas to psychology by means of the theory of "complexes". I state this before giving the results of my research on the causes of crime, which research proves Cesare Lombroso's theory, on which criminal anthropology is based, to be mistaken. I do not wish this statement of mine to sound disrespectful to the scientist whose position in the scale of values is only very slightly lower than that of Freud.

In 1876 Lombroso, while carrying out a post-mortem on the corpse of a brigand, discovered in the occipital region of the cranium, a small depression similar to that which is found in animals belonging to the higher orders and more particularly in apes. This, together with other anomalies discovered on the bodies of delinquents, furnished him with data which he considered to be sufficient for the basis of his famous theory; where there is moral degradation there is always physical degeneration to a greater or lesser degree. Criminal anthropology was based on such a theoretical foundation and became a science to itself in the sphere of natural sciences, and is connected with biology and anthropology. Criminal anthropology is to-day, seventy years of age and the books which have been written thereon are far more numerous than those which have been written on the ancient sciences of astronomy and mathematics.

During Lombroso's lifetime, sociologists and jurists attacked his theory maintaining that the causes of crime are to be found in the social field and not in the constitution of the individual. The fight between the supporters of biophysiopsychic causes and those who supported sociological causes for crime was won easily by the former when they admitted that there were also social causes (abject poverty, environment, etc.,) still maintaining, however, that the importance of these causes is only secondary.

The sociologists also ended by admitting causes deriving from the constitution of the individual, but still insisting that social causes are more decisive. It was inevitable that in a contest between a social science and a physical science, the latter should prevail. What results has criminal anthropology furnished after seventy years of flourishing existence? Are we now in a position to be able to pick out future criminals from the pupils of a school? Is there any medical man who examines candidates for bank employment in order to ascertain whether or no they are predisposed to crime? Do we know which physical anomalies lead a criminal to prefer embezzlement to the falsification of bank notes? How can we cure men who are predisposed to delinquency? Are there any qualified medical men who specialize in this department and is there a class of patients who ask for their services? We are sorrowfully obliged to reply in the negative to all these questions. There is a large number of professors, of cathedras and very many books deal with criminal anthropology. The question arises: is criminal anthropology a real science or is it an important chapter of biology and anthropology?

Criminal anthropology studies delinquency starting from the axiom that the causes of crime are to be found in the individual delinquent, which is to say, starting from Lombroso's theory. There is a definition of a criminal which is worthy of Monsieur de la Palisse: "he who commits a crime is a criminal." This does not tell us much, but as the word "criminal" derives from "crime," we see what crime is. To be able to give a definition of crime puts us well on the way to knowing the criminal. Now crime is nothing but the breaking of a penal law. This definition also, which is abstract and formal tells us nothing about crime. It is to be expected that—after seventy years of life—criminal anthropology will supply us through its numerous books, with a more detailed definition of crime, that it will enable us in short, to distinguish a criminal from a non-criminal action without the aid of penal laws. The reader can search for this definition in the books written on criminal anthropology, but he will not be able to find it. Father Gemelli in his book "Criminal Psychology" informs us *en passant* that crime is an abnormal fact and leaves it at that. A famous encyclopedia on criminal anthropology published in Turin gives the term "sexual crime" *et similia*, but does not mention the plain word "crime". All this is astounding and unbelievable.

It is an undoubted fact that, socially speaking, crime is an abnormal fact. Inasmuch as crime means the breaking of social rules, (*juristic penal*) it is contrary to normality and, therefore, abnormal. But, (and here may I be allowed to make the comparison?) the emission of intestinal gas in public is an abnormal action, inasmuch as it is contrary to social rules (of behavior), but, at the same time, it is, physiologically speaking, a normal action. From a physiological standpoint it is an abnormal action to voluntarily retain intestinal gas, in fact said voluntary retention is an action which is contrary to nature.

The error on which Lombroso's theory and, consequently criminal anthropology are based is an abnormality of social life is considered to be abnormal in the absolute meaning of the word and, therefore also in the naturistic sense as if social organization were a pure product of nature like the organization of bees, ants and other animals. Beehives and ant-heaps are nothing more than biological families. Nature knows no vaster organization than that of such families. Beehives and ant-heaps are ruled by the iron laws of biology, which, being physical laws, are defined as being inviolable, while social laws are distinguished by the absolute "irreplaceable" characteristic of violability.

Social and moral laws, starting from those dealing with behavior,

very seldom coincide with the laws of nature. When nature insists on the exigencies of right and morality being maintained, the moralist and the legislator refrain from putting the insistence into words; that is, they do not impose them upon men by threats of penal sanctions or public opinion. Nature acts on her own. It is in the cases where nature is in contrast with social exigencies that moral law comes in and penal law threatens. A simple example of a case where penal law coincides with natural law is that of the crime of procured abortion, where the legislator, building on the instinct of self-preservation, and, therefore, on nature, has not declared self-lesion to be a crime. Self-lesion, it must be noted, is considered to be a crime under our laws, only when it involves others.

The claim of the Lombrosian school and of criminal anthropology to search for the cause of violation of a social rule (penal law) in nature, namely in the individual constitution of man (the active subject of the crime) appears to be absolutely absurd and not only anti-scientific.

If a queen bee were not to lay her eggs after the mortal encounter with the male of the species, then it would be necessary to look for an abnormal physical or physiological characteristic in the given individual; not when a man commits a crime violating a man-made law. Each aspect of the phenomenon of crime always finds a sociological explanation.

Why is there a lower percentage of crime among women? Have women more natural innate defects than men? Criminal anthropology cannot give a clear answer to this question. Lombroso states that the counterpart of male delinquency is female prostitution. Does nature know the term "prostitution"? Certainly not. Prostitution is a social phenomenon which comes under economic and moral laws. After a war, crime increases and criminals are more numerous and it is noted that, in the course of a few years, crimes and criminals return to their normal numbers, very much as an epidemic does. Can it be a delinquency "virus" rather than physical taints or pathological diseases? To this query criminal anthropology cannot reply, or finds it convenient to bring in concomitant social causes.

The truth is that, as crime is a purely juridic fact, so delinquency is a social one. Woman, in our social world has fewer duties than man in the economic field and this fact explains the low percentage of woman criminals, which percentage, in North America where women take a more active part in production, rises in direct proportion to said activity. It is to be noted also among many animals that the female is exempted

by nature from some forms of combat. The male fights for the satisfaction of the sexual urge. The female waits. After a war it is not an outbreak of crime which appears, but there is a weakening of the strength of the State, a political crisis (and, therefore, a police crisis) plus a general relaxation of morals and behavior. Crime is essentially a social phenomenon and jurists and sociologists should study it, not doctors and biologists. Lombroso discovered a relationship between the constitution of the individual and crime, but he found no relationship to causes. If Lombroso and his numerous followers had studied man instead of the criminal, focussing all their attention on the individual, if, I repeat, they had studied "crime" they would have avoided falling into fundamental error. The Lombrosian school consider the abnormality of crime to be an absolute axiom and, consequently, they turn to the constitution in their search for the causes of delinquency. Are criminals abnormal people? If they are, then we must consider that the moral and religious laws given by God to Moses engraved on the Tables of the Law: "Thou shalt not kill", "Thou shalt not steal" and "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife" as well as the other commandments, are addressed to abnormal persons.

To obtain "normal" obedience from living beings, God uses the laws of nature. It would have been superfluous for the Creator to forbid through Moses what was against His will when He created man. On the contrary God entrusted a special task to man—the difficult task of mastering nature.

Our religion considers as "saintly" a man who does not stain his soul with sin and deems it heroic not to sin. "We are all sinners" say the Saints, as if to confirm that sin is normal.

Our religion considers sin as being normal: "We are made of flesh" and the victorious effort to overcome sin is considered as abnormal, heroic and saintly. This wisdom is older than the sciences of biology and anthropology. For the last thousand years penal science has been repeating that there is no crime without there being a law against it: and so it is. The law was born before the crime. It is the law which makes the crime. This is no paradox, neither is the first impression one may have of the theory of causes of crime which I am about to explain, paradoxical: all men have a natural tendency to crime, except in cases of degeneration. It is a fact that an abulic person cannot commit crimes against the integrity of the State and a moron cannot embezzle nor can an impotent man commit the crime of rape.

Let us consider animals of all kinds, both tame and wild: horses,

dogs, cats, rabbits, lions, wolves, insects, etc., they fight each against their own kind for the conquest of prey and of the female. Very often the fight is hard, occasionally it is cruel, rarely is it mortal. Japanese cocks (which have formidable beaks and delicate skins) kill each other.

In insect families the contest for the female is often mortal. Male buffalos fight until only one is left to be the sole master of the herd. This is a law of nature. It is not for us to examine the ends fixed by nature for the fight for life (the female and prey). Perhaps it is done to ensure the survival of the fittest? In the early days of human existence, man, too, was obliged to live within the boundaries of natural association of the biological family. It is not only Rousseau who conceived a human state pre-existent to society. At that time, wounding and killing, preying for food and women were the normal forms of existence. Later on, when society came into being, through an historical and not through a natural process, and social necessities appeared, regulations were made, the rules of behavior were fixed, probably in the first place under religion and morality, becoming penal in time. Society could not leave man free without destroying itself; it may be a shock, but it is an undoubted fact that the individual is obliged to belong to society! In order to protect its interests, society has been compelled to permit the fight for life within certain limits: thus were social laws born. These laws are in contrast with free instincts which they limit and direct, preventing them from acting in given circumstances, places and times.

A man, when he is born, even if he is born in the midst of a very developed people (in a social sense), knows nothing of social rules and regulations and a child does some things quite freely in public which the rules of good behavior forbid to adults, compelling them to retire to a private room. The child, acting by instinct snatches the apple or the biscuit his companion or his little brother grasps in his hand. How many lessons and how many years are necessary to educate a child to social life? What makes up the greater part of this education, if it be not prohibitions, "you cannot do that", "not now", "not like that"? Social rules are thus imposed on the individual who is reluctant to accept them. To obtain the object, use is made of prizes, flattery, scolding, encouragement, threats and corporal punishment. This process of forming the component of organized society is, in a certain sense, a process of denaturalization. Society cannot annul physical forces and the animal nature of man, but compels them, changes them through a rational process which is called education.

Among the possible obstacles to the work of education of the child, the adolescent, the youth, are the "complexes" of Freud.

The child and the adolescent when the activity of their instincts comes up against morality, behavior, religion or prejudice develop a guilty feeling which generates "repression". Repressions generate "complexes" and "complexes" may generate crime.

Another danger and this is the most important one as far as effects of the causes of delinquency are concerned, is the insufficient or mistaken educative formation of the member of society.

In reality what we teach children, adolescents and young people is to dominate their instincts. Crime as a human fact is an episode of the fight for life which is in contrast with a social regulation having penal characteristics; it is an episode of the never ending fight for the acquisition of food and the female—of the battle which nature imposes on mankind.

Human criminal manifestations which cannot be classified under the headings of crime against property or crimes *passionels* (the so-called political crimes or those which are linked up with the feeling of honor) are episodes which, in the long run, through the strengthening of personality, bring the individual to a point where he is able to get himself food and a female. In our society money and material goods are the equivalent of prey and of the female, inasmuch as money is the key to conquest. As social laws which rule the interests of society in this never-ending battle which is inevitable are not in accordance with instinct, it is necessary to know the laws and also is it necessary to know how to put them into practice. He who makes a mistake is a delinquent. It is impossible for man to obey social laws naturally and—in fact—in order to obey them man must undergo a long and special process of denaturalization (education, forming of social conscience, acquirement of a social personality.)

Social laws take for granted that the adult possesses this knowledge and this point of view, but very often this is not so.

A gypsy who wanders from one European country to another knows only the laws of gypsy society, among which is that of vengeance (personal justice) and has an imperfect knowledge of the penal laws of the European countries. Does the youth born and bred in the slums of Naples, the youth whose father has been repeatedly in prison, or the lad whose home is in the narrow streets which are characteristic of the port of Genoa, know social laws and, more especially, penal laws? Such a youth knows that the police are "rotters", people one must not trust,



he knows that theft is called "work", he gets food by any means (the Police are bad because they prevent our getting food) he knows that Peter and Anthony's mother is rich because she is kept by a wealthy man. He knows many things appertaining to his narrow life, to his circle of thieves and delinquents, but he knows very little about social laws. It is not logical to expect knowledge of laws, when one realizes that not all young people have the same educational advantages. Is the work which has been done to "civilize" the instincts of a young lord (self control!) equal to the effort a poor widow, who is practically destitute, living in the poorer suburbs of Milan, must accomplish in order to educate her child?

It is as well now not to put off any longer the statement of my theory.

### A THEORY OF CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR

Human actions which are called crimes are generated by the purest and healthiest of human instincts and are part and parcel of the episodic battle for life (which is common to all living creatures) yet they are forbidden by law because they are in contrast with actual exigencies of society. The word "actual" is important. In the early days of Rome (Laws of the XII Tables) the Pater Familias could kill his son if he had done something wrong towards him or toward others. Today the father who beats his son is guilty in the eyes of the law and, should he kill him, he is guilty of the gravest of crimes: parricide. Up to 1943 Italian law considered it a crime to criticize the Head of the State (offending the Head of the Government) while today such criticism is the right of every citizen. Actuality can refer to space as well as to time. In Europe and in western countries, it is considered wrong to undress in public in order to bathe. This is not so in Japan.

I have already stated that the first impression which is made by my theory is that all normal men have a tendency to crime. The second impression is that crime is a human manifestation. Human manifestations which violate the rules of behavior are spontaneous and sudden. The third impression is that human manifestations which conform to the law are not spontaneous, but are due to custom (education) and that they are sometimes obligatory (subject to penal sanctions). The fourth and most important impression is the following: seen under a naturalistic or biologic scientific point of view, crime is a natural fact. Like Bronislaw Malinowski I also have lived among "savages" and by savages I mean those who live in an atmosphere of crime. I have lived in the underworld as a modest student, but I had quite extraordi-

nary opportunities for investigation first as a member and later on as head of the Milan flying squad—Milan being one of the few European cities where national and international criminals play an active part. (In “specific” order these cities are Paris, London, Milan, Marseilles.) The most famous students of criminal anthropology did not fail to procure human material; they were, however, obliged to seek it in the prisons. A prisoner is a prisoner. An imprisoned criminal is studied *a posteriori*. The prisoner is a member of a college, he is a sad collegian and the environment is formed more than by crime, by the walls and the cells, by the play of light and shade, by the warders and especially by the “regulations”. He is a “marked” man, a number, unhappy because he is deprived of freedom, outside the pale of society. The prisoner, even when he is innocent, an honest man, is very similar to the other prisoners who are criminals. I have—on the other hand—known delinquents when they were free, when they were preparing to commit a crime, while they were perpetrating it and immediately after the crime. I have met delinquents who did not want to commit crime again, I have known child criminals, young boys, youths who were delinquents. The term “newly born delinquent” is not illogic. Out of ten children who were born about thirty years ago in Piazza Vetra in Milan, eight developed into criminals. I have known these children, I have caressed them, I have seen them grow up and I knew their parents and many of their family affairs. I know that those among them who were tainted, the children of syphilitics, of alcoholized parents, have become tramps, beggars, petty thieves or miserable ruffians. I know that the healthier children, those who were stronger, those who were the least Lombrosian have become clever thieves, burglars, heads of criminal gangs, hold-up men. All my knowledge of criminal anthropology vanished as I got to know the men of the underworld and investigated the causes of a given crime. Starting from the fact of the crime I was led to study the phenomenon of crime and to explore scientifically and methodically the causes of the delinquency. The discoveries I made are sensational and may appear to be paradoxes. In these paragraphs I have written the principal points of my theory and a few but necessary criticisms of current science. I could, however add more criticisms.

Among the taints and illnesses which lead to crime, the principal ones are: drunkenness, syphilis and epilepsy.

It is true; these illnesses are common to more than eighty percent of criminals. It is true also that some somatic characteristics (facial asymmetry, low forehead, prognathism, etc.,) are often to be found among

criminals. But it is true also that such illnesses and such somatic characteristics belong to a certain class of society, the class of unfortunates, and also to a certain type of human being, the rough type which we often meet with among the very poor. It is a fact that abject poverty and crime are nearly always both present in the same individuals, but the process of derivation is different. Abject poverty which has been handed down from generation to generation forms the physical type and also the taints which criminal anthropology has found in criminals, poverty is also the cause of insufficient social education (example and environment form education) and poverty deprives the individual of that minimum of equipment which is necessary for him to be able to play his part in social life. The criminal is a badly educated member of society, he is an unfortunate being, he is at a disadvantage in the battle for existence which society has regulated according to social laws; this disadvantage is due to the individual's precarious financial position. The delinquent resembles a peasant who enters a tournament of knights and fights without a helmet, without armor, without saluting the ladies, without respecting the boundaries and regulations of the duel. He fights with edged tools as if against a wild boar or a wolf, with cunning and he hits "below the belt". The peasant is thrown out of the jousting field, beaten and shut up in the castle dungeon. The famous lack or deficiency of inhibitory centres which, according to criminal anthropology do not allow a man to conform to the laws is, in reality, nonexistent. The cleverest criminals are in full possession of inhibitory faculties. Think what inhibitory faculties the pickpocket must have in order to control himself, posing as a tourist, or a peaceful clerk, while studying the movements and the thoughts of his victim, using all the time an astounding psychological intuition!

The lock picker must carry out his work accurately, quickly, but exactly, using tools which may not be suitable so as to conquer the resistance offered by a door or by a safe within a few hours, a few minutes, in the dark: Patience, perseverance and self control are his characteristics. And then do not criminals conform to the rules and regulations of their own society, of the underworld? Is not the principal rule of not betraying always obeyed?

The causes of delinquency are deficient social education and the lack of means which enable a man to fight according to the conformist method. The battle which society imposes on its members for the conquest of prey and females takes it for granted that the individual is supplied not only with education, but also with a minimum of arms, viz., a certain

amount of money. A wealthy man with arrogant instincts regarding prey and females, can acquire further wealth according to the saying, "money goes where money is" and he is in a position to have a good time with women thereby earning the not-to-be-despised title of "Don Juan". A poor man who has the same instincts is obliged to steal in order to acquire money and has to fight or commit a crime of violence in order to have a woman; very often he has to steal so as to have the money to pay for mercenary love; in short he is compelled to become a criminal. For these reasons of "insufficient education and insufficient arms for the battle" the army of delinquency collects its members from among the very poor. My conclusions cannot, however, deny some of the results of criminal anthropology, namely the relationship existing between madness and crime, between constitution and crime.

The relationship exists, but it is not a cause. It is only in appearance that it is a cause. It is accepted as such by all students of criminal anthropology who mistakenly consider crime to be abnormal in the absolute meaning of the word. First of all it must be noted that ninety per-cent of crimes are against property and in these there is no relationship to madness (the cases of kleptomania happen once in a blue moon) and madness is not met with in other crimes such as those committed against the integrity of the State. The relationship between crime and insanity is found in some crimes of violence and also in some sex-crimes, therefore only in a very small proportion of delinquencies. Above relationship is rarely met with and not always even in certain specific crimes. It must be noted that crime is a material and intentional fact; where intention is lacking (insanity excludes intention) there is no crime. The expression "criminal insanity" has no moral or juridic meaning.

The madman who kills a butterfly is similar to the madman who falls in love with the moon, to the madman who thinks he is Hitler and to the madman who murders a man. These madmen are not respectively a monster of cruelty, a pagan god, a man responsible for the last world war and a murderer; where there is insanity there is no responsibility and therefore there is no crime. The murder committed by a madman is an episode which comes under clinical examination and is not a matter for the administration of Justice. *Videar neurologus* and not *videar praetor*.

I have spoken of madness and insane persons in the strict sense of the terms. There are also those crimes which are committed by persons who, in their other physical or social manifestations during even a very long time, have appeared to be normal and yet at long last commit

crimes of sadism, deeds of extreme violence, induced thereto by a latent unnoticed insanity. Recent American films are full of suchlike cases and endeavor to show how psycho-analysis is able to cure certain forms of madness and thus avoid a crime being committed. In a few words, crimes deriving from Freudian complexes can be examined. Here I refer to Malinowski's discovery. Ancestral complexes are non-existent and non-existent are complexes which are rooted in human nature. The complex is formed by clumsy, obligatory, hurried irrational imposition of moral rules, of religious laws, behavior and by prejudices. The feeling of guilt which is born in the conscience when free instinct and social law come up against each other, the need to conceal, to forget the fault, form repressions and from repressions complexes are born.

When the repression explodes it may cause crime. The causality of the neurological state in relation to crime is merely secondary. It is morality, the social rules which coming up against the drives called instincts and forming the complex from which the crime is derived.

The real cause which originated the crime is always of social origin; is indeed, a social fact a professional accident of the educators (parents, brothers, masters, companions) an accident which occurred during their work for the social formation (education) of the individual.

Crime is, therefore, not caused by a pathological, but by a social condition which generates the neurological state in which the crime develops as an ultimate consequence. In this case also the therapy of delinquency belongs to educators, sociologists, moralists and legislators, not to medical men. I do not know why students choose murder as the prototype of crime or why they consider the crimes of murder committed by sadists or madmen to be the most interesting or why they draw their conclusions on the phenomena of crime from these particular examples. If thieves, embezzlers, forgers, criminals who aim at the integrity of the State did not exist, ninety-eight out of every hundred judges and policemen could be dismissed.

The phenomenon of delinquency would be reduced to a few clinical cases and fewer cases of bad customs. Yes, murder is committed also because of customs! The Calabrian shepherd who kills his unfaithful wife is compelled to kill her even if he does not feel jealousy, even if he still loves his wife, even if the sight of blood horrifies him. His relatives, friends, his society, his narrow society forces him to obey the local customs. The shepherd must cleanse his dishonor with blood. In Albania where, the Napoleonic Code was introduced in 1913 there still exists in the Cossovo region another ancient code which contains the

Biblical "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." The Napoleonic Code forbids the application of the law of vengeance in Cossovo and it is a fact that the gypsies keep to the law and go before the judges when they are subjected to violence. But the noble families cannot appeal to a judge without being dishonored, losing caste and prestige. If a member of the Mezet family should kill a Mehemet, the family must murder a Mezet, after which a Mezet will kill a Mehemet and so on until mutual friends or relatives make peace between the two families, which peace is called "Besa." Here we see how tribal law creates crime. In cases of procured abortion is it not rather prejudice than a rule of customs which leads to crime? Among Eastern peoples, who are three fifths of the inhabitants of the world, the crime of procured abortion is almost unknown because these nations do not consider that the honor of a person or of a family has anything to do with the anatomy of a woman. A Bey who had studied in Paris once said to me: "You Occidentals entrust your honor to a frail woman, to a third person. In the East virginity is prized, highly prized, but it is not a state and an exercise of virtue. In the East the birth of a child is always a happy event and nobody is born a bastard." The woman who kills the child she has borne as the result of an illicit love affair is—in the moment in which she commits the crime—unnatural. The woman who procures an abortion is also unnatural as is the couple who use Neomalthusian practices. If women could have their babies peacefully, without having to give reasons and explanations to anyone, as rabbits do, what woman, what mother would kill her child? If such a thing were to happen who would think of a conscious homicidal will? One would say: "That woman is insane, she has murdered her own child" just as one says: "That man is mad, he always walks backwards!"

The conclusion to which Gaspare Virgilio comes, namely that crime is a morbid fact, was due to his having chosen murder as the prototype of crime to be studied (whereas the prototype of crime is theft: murder may be committed for theft, but nobody steals to murder). Virgilio studied the relationship between madness and crime and in this study he took advantage of Esquirol and Pinel's studies. The relationship between constitution, soma and crime which were discovered by Lombroso were known in ancient times. The horrible and horrifying aspect of certain men has been described in the earliest classics and by Homer himself.

These relationships are not, I repeat, causes. The sexual type will become a charming Don Juan if he is well educated and if he has a

good fighting position in society, but if he is badly educated and abjectly poor, he will become a sadist, a ravisher, an exhibitionist. In the same way the selfsame individual with the same constitution may become either a Don Juan or a criminal, according to his education, so another type may develop into a hero or a murderer, an able diplomat or a miserable hypocrite. When a man is forced to fight in the battle for life he does it in such a manner as to make the most of his physical, physiological and psychological tendencies, whether he observes social laws, or breaks them. The most able pickpockets in Europe are Spaniards and the most able in the whole world are South Americans. The same can be said about the best barbers. Germans have heavy hands and do not supply Europe with pickpockets; they are also very poor barbers. In Italy we find the best mechanics in Lombardy where we also find the best thieves. When a safe is forced in Rome, the local police telephone immediately to the Milan Police: the thief is sure to be a Milanese. When in Milan there are an unusual number of thefts committed by pickpockets, the Police send out policemen to look for Romans. A matrimonial crime such as bigamy is, in Italy, almost always committed by a Calabrian or a Sardinian. Before the war, it was known that five out of every ten thefts committed in the streets were carried out by Sicilians. The relationship between profession and crime, between customs and crime are very interesting and should be studied by anthropologists and sociologists; but it must be remembered that they are the causes of the choice of crime and not of the determination to commit crime.

In order to have a complete understanding of crime it is necessary to study society from all points of view. Let us consider what happens in the Scandinavian States where more than a century of peace has allowed living conditions to rise, where wealth is fairly distributed and where the education of young people has developed in a remarkable manner. Here crimes against property are in the proportion of one to ten in comparison with the same sort of crimes committed in France and Italy. In Switzerland, where the most modest social class is in a position to lead a more comfortable life than do members of our Italian middle class, and where social education has become a national characteristic, there are far fewer thefts than in our country. The inhabitants of Bellinzona and Lugano speak Italian and have Italian blood in their veins: one can leave one's bicycle in the street without its being stolen, while at Sesto Calende or Gallarate it would almost certainly be stolen.

Crimes committed by sadists and obsessed persons are more common in Northern countries where morality is very rigid than in Southern European Countries. These crimes, as I have already said, spring from morbid complexes which have been formed by the strictness of morality. According to my theory which states that delinquency is a normal manifestation of the instincts and that, therefore, the criminal is a person who has not received a good social education, man who is not supplied with proper arms for the fight for existence, it becomes easy to find preventive means and the therapy of delinquency: good education, well-being, the formation of social personality in the individual. It is much and—at the same time—it is little.

The errors of criminal anthropology cause great damage to society. Educators and legislators, considering the delinquent to be tainted and a pathological subject fight a useless battle. Good sense prevails here and there and methods and systems which are far from Lombrosian theories crop up all over the place.

Before Lombroso cried "Eureka", flourishing his blood-stained lancet, thus starting criminal anthropology, the poet Victor Hugo discovered that truth of which I have spoken. The hero of Victor Hugo's most famous novel is a poor devil who cannot bear to look upon the food begging of the hungry children of his brother's widow. He steals a loaf to stay their hunger. He is arrested, condemned, sent to hard labor. He is no longer a man, but a beast to be avoided. A saintly priest gives him back the feeling of the love of men and makes him a present of the silver candlesticks thus giving him—as I say—the arms to fight with in the tournament of life. The ex-criminal then fights as a conformist, under a false name and not only does he earn his bread, but he acquires wealth. But not happiness. He is unhappy because every time he tries to act according to his heart, society is against him. The inspector Javert discovers that the mayor Valjean—the manufacturer Valjean—is the delinquent who has been in prison doing hard labor and this discovery is made at the moment in which Valjean is risking his life to save a fellowman from being crushed by the wheels of a heavy cart. This mayor, this manufacturer, in throwing himself down into the mud forgot the dignity of his position and disobeyed a social law, a law of behavior, customary behavior. Society, in the person of Inspector Javert is offended. It is unnecessary to save a man by risking one's own life; it is necessary to obey social laws, even those of prejudice. This is the moral of the moral.



Let us consider delinquents as being the first victims of their own crimes. They are unfortunate men. Let us help them to rise.

Let us educate children to the fight for life according to the rules of society, let us give everyone the weapons which are necessary for the fight and let us correct these social laws and regulations. Not always are they right and just.